

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Pat nt and Trad mark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Address:	COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
	Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKÉT NO.	
08/859,353	05/20/97	ALMEIDA		А	034367-1
QM02/0130 SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON DC 20037-3202			\neg		EXAMINER
				LEE,K	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	_			3753	1
				DATE MAILE	
					01/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

08/859,353 Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

De Almeida

Examiner

Application No.

Kevin Lee

Group Art Unit 3753



Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
This action is FINAL.			
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for f in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935	formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to a slonger, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extension 37 CFR 1.136(a).,	respond within the period for response will cause the		
Disposition of Claims			
Claim(s) 4	is/are pending in the application.		
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
Claim(s)			
X Claim(s) 4			
Claim(s)			
☐ Claims			
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing			
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objecte			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is _approved _disapproved.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority up All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of			
received.			
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number			
$oxedsymbol{\square}$ received in this national stage application from the Ir	nternational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
*Certified copies not received:			
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority	under 35 U.S.C. 3 119(e).		
Attachment(s)	,		
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 ■			
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)		
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413			
 □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152 			
□ Notice of informal Latent Application, 1 10-102			
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON TH	UE FOLLOWING PAGES		

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 3753

DETAILED ACTION

Interference

1. Applicant's request under 37 CFR 1.607 filed September 17, 1999 and December 15, 1999 has been throughly reviewed and considered by the examiner. The request has been denied at this time due to the claim 4 of the instant application not being allowable as previously indicated. The indicated allowability of claim 4 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Jaikaran, Corteville et al and Short. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The preamble of the claim indicates that the apparatus is intended to be used in an oil well having a casing with tubing but the body of the claim recites a positive combination of the apparatus and the tubing of the casing. Therefore, the recitation of "said tubing" in line 3 of the claim lacks positive antecedent basis.

أيي

Art Unit: 3753

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaikaran. The patent to Jaikaran discloses an apparatus comprising a nozzle (96) mounted in a housing (130). The nozzle is a continuously open passage consisting of a curved inlet portion, a smooth straight, intermediate portion and a smooth, outwardly tapered conical shaped outlet portion, see Figures 1 and 10. The apparatus of Jaikaran is recited to control the flow of an oil or other production fluid, col. 1, lines 5-9. It would have been an obvious design expedient to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Jaikaran to use gas as the production fluid. A flow of gas past the check valve (10) and through the nozzle (96) will by laws of fluid dynamics result in the gas flow being gradually slowed down in the restricted Venturi passage of the nozzle, reducing the gas pressure loss and rendering the flow isoentropic.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corteville et al. The patent to Corteville et al discloses an apparatus comprising a nozzle (11) mounted in a housing.

The nozzle is a continuously open passage consisting of a curved inlet portion, a smooth straight, intermediate portion and a smooth, outwardly tapered conical shaped outlet portion, see Figure 2.

The apparatus of Corteville et al. is used to control the flow of a production fluid (1), see Figure

Application/Control Number: 08/859,353

Art Unit: 3753

1. It would have been an obvious design expedient to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Corteville et al. to use gas as the production fluid within the well. A flow of gas past the check valve (17) and through the nozzle (11) will by laws of fluid dynamics result in the gas flow being gradually slowed down in the restricted Venturi passage of the nozzle, reducing the gas pressure loss and rendering the flow isoentropic.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Short. The patent to Short discloses an apparatus comprising a nozzle (46) mounted in a housing (36, 54). The nozzle is a continuously open passage consisting of a curved inlet portion, a smooth straight, intermediate portion and a smooth, outwardly tapered conical shaped outlet portion, see Figure 2A. Figure 4 shows another embodiment wherein a nozzle (136) is disclosed therein. The apparatus of Short is used to control the flow of a liquid. It would have been an obvious design expedient to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the apparatus of Short to control the flow of gas from within the well. A flow of gas past the check valves (106, 180) and through the nozzles (46, 136), respectively, will by laws of fluid dynamics result in the gas flow being gradually slowed down in the restricted Venturi passage of the nozzle, reducing the gas pressure loss and rendering the flow isoentropic.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to KEVIN LEE at telephone number (703) 308-1025. The Group 3750 fax number is (703) 308-7766.

JANUARY 25, 2001

Kevin Lee Primary Examiner